

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-33, and 41 are currently pending in this application. By way of this Reply, claims 1-2, 7, 13, 19 and 32 are amended, claim 3 is canceled, without prejudice, and claim 41 is newly added.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 6, 20, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 6, 20, and 28 comply with the written description requirement. With regards to Claims 6 and 28, the Examiner states that there is nothing in the Specification that guides "how to make the determination of dosage and coating." However, due to the fact that the multi-purpose paper of the present invention is used for cultivating crops, different multi-purpose papers with different particular features suitable for cultivating different types of crops are reasonably expected. Accordingly, it is believed that it would be obvious to one skilled in the art that the compositions and quantities of compositions contained in the multi-purpose paper of the present invention can be changed when used for growing different types of crops.

Support for claim 6 can be found at paragraph [0065] of the specification which indicates that the dosage of calcium carbonate is based on the paper material and the desired paper features. Based on this disclosure, it would be obvious to one

skilled in the art that the dosage of calcium carbonate is decided by the types of crops. It is believed that one skilled in the art would recognize that a multi-purpose paper containing different dosages of calcium carbonate has different particular paper features for cultivating different types of crops. In addition, the dosage of calcium carbonate can be affected by the types of microorganisms coated or contained in the multi-purpose paper, which needs calcium ion to promote its proliferation. See specification at paragraph [0065]. Generally speaking, the dosage of calcium carbonate is generally ranged from 0.1-5%.

Referring to claim 28, the formula for coated fertilizer is similarly decided by types of crops. Both the formula and the coating amount are different for different types of crops, which as previously stated, is believed to be obvious to one skilled in the art. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter of Claims 6 and 28 have been described in the specification so as to convey to one skilled in the art.

Referring to Claim 20, the Examiner asserts that there is nothing in the specification that guides how to make use of the invention for the different uses as claimed, specially for temperature control devices, hot water pipes, etc. It seems that the Examiner has misunderstood the recitation in Claim 20. Claim 20 recites that the multi-purpose paper can be used in one of domestically cultivating box and industrial applications. According to Claim 20, the industrial applications could be

selected from indoor and outdoor net supports, papery recyclable cultivating plate, and artificial indoor planting system with devices of temperature control, cold and hot water pipes, and light control. That is to say, the multi-purpose paper of the present invention can be used in an artificial indoor planting system. Clearly, it is obvious for one skill in the art to understand that an artificial indoor planting system, which usually means a greenhouse, an indoor farmland, or a conservatory, contains equipment such as temperature control devices, cold and hot water pipes, and/or light control. It is also obvious for one skill in the art to realize that the multi-purpose paper of the present invention can be used in this kind of environment. Hence, the Applicant respectfully submits that the specification properly discloses how to make use of the invention.

In addition, the Examiner rejected Claims 2, 6, 7, 13, 19, 28, 32 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as his invention. While Applicant disagrees with the basis for these rejections, claims 2, 7, 13, 19 and 32 have been amended and are believed to be in compliance with § 112, second paragraph. As to Claims 6 and 28, Applicant believes that these claims are fully supported by the specification for the reasons stated above.

Referring to Claim 33, the Examiner questions how the parameters for making the structure are based in the requirements of a specific crop. As stated

above, different types of crops need different cultivating environments and conditions to grow. Therefore, it is believed that it would be obvious for one skilled in the art to make different uneven structures to suit the needs of different crops.

Using the seed 100 in Fig. 2 of the present invention as an example, the shape of the uneven structure 41 is made to suit the shape of the particular seed and the required space for that seed to root and germinate. Furthermore, the features of the uneven structure 41 can be made and adjusted in a way that is specifically suitable for the specific crop, i.e., a certain water-preventing ability, a certain amount of coating fertilizer, or a certain air permeability. Accordingly, Claim 33 is believed to be in compliance with § 112, second paragraph.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b)/102(e) as being anticipated by Bartelloni (U.S. Patent 4,510,019), or Hoffman (U.S. Patent 5,061,345), or Watson et al. (U.S. Patent 6,447,640), and Reiner et al (U.S. Patent 6,344,110). In addition, claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by Holloway (U.S. Patent 6,446,386).

Applicant respectfully submits that none of the references cited by the Examiner renders the present invention anticipated. Claim 1, as amended, discloses a method of manufacturing a multi-purpose paper, which comprises, in part, the step of, "processing plural steps including classifying, pulp-dispersing,

Applicant: Ching-Chung Huang
Application No.: 10/001,318

coarse pulp-clarifying, fiber-separation, coarse screening, fine pulp-clarifying, heat-dispersion, fine screening, bleaching, pulp-washing and pulp-refining steps to form said multi-purpose paper." None of these references disclose all of the processing steps recited in claim 1. Accordingly, the presently claimed invention cannot be anticipated by the cited prior art.

For the above stated reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the presently claimed invention is patentable over the prior art. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Ching-Chung Huang

By Ryan W. O'Donnell
Ryan W. O'Donnell
Registration No. 53,401
(215) 568-6400

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.
United Plaza, Suite 1600
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103

RWO/
Enclosure